

thoroughly the terrorist threats that could in fact jeopardize the lives of ordinary Americans.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. J. Res. 78, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2002

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the previous order of the House, I call up the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 78) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2002, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 78 is as follows:

H. J. RES. 78

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 107-44 is further amended by striking the date specified in section 107(c) and inserting in lieu thereof "December 21, 2001".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, December 12, 2001, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before the House, House Joint Resolution 78, will extend the current continuing resolution until December 21, at which time we hope to have all of the appropriations bills completed and on the President's desk.

□ 1030

Mr. Speaker, this is a noncontroversial CR. The terms and conditions of the previous continuing resolution will remain in effect. All ongoing activities will be continued at current rates, under the same terms and conditions as fiscal year 2001, with the exception of the agencies covered by the fiscal year 2002 appropriations bills that have already been enacted into law.

Nine of the fiscal year 2002 13 appropriations bills have already been signed, plus two supplemental appropriations bills. One more 2002 bill is awaiting the President's signature. That is the District of Columbia appropriations bill.

Most of the government agencies are already operating at fiscal year 2002

levels. We are prepared to present the three remaining bills, the Foreign Operations bill, the Labor-HHS bill and the Defense bill when the House reconvenes next week, and we expect those bills to be completed and ready to go through the process.

I urge the House to move the CR to the Senate and so we can get on with the rest of the business of the day.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to rise in support of this continuing resolution. I think the gentleman is correct. We are hoping that by a week from this coming Friday or Saturday someone will have found the off button for this Congress and will be able to actually press it and shut it down for the Christmas season. Things can always get in the way, but I hope that they do not.

As the gentleman has indicated, there are about three major impediments to our adjourning remaining. One is the Labor, Health, Education appropriation bill. We are very close to agreement on that. The second is the Defense appropriations bill, to which has been added the post-September 11 anti-terrorism supplemental. And then we have the potential for a stimulus package which could either wind up being a true stimulus to the economy or just another tax boondoggle. This committee has no control over what is produced on that score.

Let me simply say, I want to take a couple of minutes because of remarks made by previous speaker about what we face next year. I think it is useful to note that while this House has had many a fight this year, that all but one of the appropriation bills, that this House passed, passed with broad bipartisan support, and the Chairman of the committee and I, I think, have developed a very good working relationship on those bills.

I have noted with considerable frustration the fact that some people in this institution manage with spectacular frequency to aim at the wrong targets in blaming, or in trying to assess blame for the loss of the surplus or for the fact that the House has not been able to shut down.

Willie Sutton, the famous bank robber, used to say that the reason he robbed banks was that that is where the money was. The problem is that we have too many people in this institution and elsewhere, including some who make their business with a pen or a computer, there are too many people who blame the appropriations process, when, in fact, in terms of budget problems, that is where the gnats are. And as a result, we keep making the same mistakes and recreating deficits all over again.

Someone said once, I do not remember if it is my favorite philosophy, Archie the cockroach, or if it was Will Rogers, one of the two, who said that experience is that quality that enables

you to recognize a mistake when you make it again, and that is what I think this Congress will go down in history as being noted for.

In 1981, this Congress passed President Reagan's budgets, and those budgets essentially quadrupled our deficits over the next few years because they separated consideration of tax matters from budget matters, and they wound up blowing a huge hole in the side of the deficit by promising very large tax cuts, which had to be paid for by borrowing a huge amount of money at the same time the defense budget was being doubled.

It took us 20 years to dig out from those deficits. We finally reached the point just 3 years ago where, I think, every American and certainly most people in this institution, if not all, took great pride in the fact that we had actually turned the corner and appeared as though we would be facing a string of surpluses. Some of us thought the size of those surpluses would be more modest than others, but nonetheless, we faced a string of surpluses, and now, this Congress, in one short year, has blown them all.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD at this point an analysis prepared by the House Committee on the Budget minority staff which is entitled "What Happened to the Surpluses," and if you look at that, you will see that we started this year with huge expectations, huge surpluses for as far as the eye could see, but by the end of the year, they are gone for three reasons essentially.

THE DISSIPATION OF THE BUDGET SURPLUS, 2001

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. On November 28, 2001, President Bush claimed that his Administration "brought sorely needed fiscal discipline to Washington." On the same day, OMB Director Mitchell Daniels warned the country not to expect another budget surplus until 2005—after President Bush's term of office is up. The unified budget surplus of \$304 billion projected for FY 2002, and the cumulative surplus of \$5.629 trillion projected over ten years, which this Administration inherited, are gone. Director Daniels blamed the economy and the fight against terrorism, and absolved the President's tax cuts. In fact, last June's tax cut is most responsible for wiping out the surplus, and the Republican stimulus plan, with further permanent tax cuts, would only dig the hole deeper.

2. The Republican tax cut contributed more than half—54.7 percent—of this worsening of the surplus, based on the bipartisan, bicameral estimates of the Budget Committee staffs.

3. The worsening of the economy, which began well before September 11, has had a significant impact in the near term (2001 to 2003). But, beyond those next few years, the effect of the economy fades as recovery takes hold. The role of increased spending—to counter terrorism and to address other priorities—is not significant.

4. On net, virtually all of today's estimated cumulative ten-year surplus of \$2.604 trillion comes from the Social Security Trust Fund surplus, and is concentrated in the future years, where the outlook is most uncertain.

5. These events and estimates prove even more that the tax cut was irresponsible. It

made the budget more vulnerable to unforeseen crises, economic misfortune, and ultimately the burdens of the baby boomers' retirement.

... we brought sorely needed fiscal discipline to Washington, D.C. ... we fought for and got a budget that was realistic, that didn't grow way beyond the means of our government.—President George Bush, November 28, 2001.

... it is regrettably my conclusion that we are unlikely to return to balance in the federal accounts before possibly fiscal '05.—OMB Director Mitchell Daniels, November 28, 2001.

OMB Director Mitchell Daniels has warned the country not to expect another budget surplus until 2005—after President George Bush's term of office is up. Director Daniels blamed the economy and the fight against terrorism; he absolved the President's tax cuts. In fact, the Administration advocates further permanent tax cuts in its economic stimulus plan. The Administration's June tax cut wiped out most of the surplus and now they want to dig the hole deeper.

From May to October of this year—a period of five months—the projected 2002 unified budget surplus of \$304 billion disappeared, and the ten-year projected surplus dropped from \$5.629 trillion to \$2.604 trillion. More bad news is sure to come with the economic and budget updates next January. Furthermore, on net, all of today's estimated cumulative ten-year surplus of \$2.604 trillion comes from the Social Security and Medicare Trust Fund surpluses. What little surplus remains is concentrated in the future years, where the outlook is most uncertain.

How did this happen? Economic cycles and the terrorist attacks surely contributed. But there is no doubt that the greatest part of this fiscal injury was self-inflicted—through an excessive tax cut.

After the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) significantly increased its projections of the budget surpluses over the ten-year horizon at the beginning of this year, the Administration and Congressional Republicans proceeded to commit virtually every scrap of the projected surplus that they could to the tax cut. The Congress passed, and the President signed, a \$1.346 trillion tax cut over the eleven fiscal years 2001–2011. With an additional \$0.386 trillion due to increased debt service, the total budgetary hit from the tax cut comes to \$1.732 trillion. Over ten years, the tax cut did leave an ostensible “reserve” of about \$500 billion; but the vast bulk of that sum, 86 percent, arose in the last five years—at which time budget projections are most uncertain.

What is even more disturbing, the Congressional Republicans, supported by the White House, pursued their tax cut to the exclusion of all other priorities, including a prudent and responsible budget reserve. In his budget address to the Congress in February, the President emphasized that he would address the programmatic needs of the government, pay down the debt, “[a]nd then, when money is still left over,” provide a tax cut. But on the contrary, what the White House and the congressional Republicans in fact did was to pass the tax cut first—before retiring debt, before even submitting a defense budget, before passing a farm bill, before providing Medicare prescription drug coverage, and so on. Now, well after the beginning of the next fiscal year, most of these other priorities have not been addressed, much less fulfilled, and the surplus is gone.

Subsequent developments have demonstrated clearly just how imprudent this tax cut was. First, the Administration, which had been talking down the economy since early December of 2000 to sell its tax

cut, saw the economy deteriorate in a self-fulfilling prophecy. And since September 11, the economy has slumped even further, while the unavoidable costs of terror-fighting and war have mounted.

Because of the further slowing of the economy (and associated technical factors), economists of the House and Senate Budget Committee staffs have estimated, on a bipartisan basis, that the surpluses in 2002 through 2004 will be reduced by \$80 billion, \$56 billion, and \$8 billion (exclusive of net interest) respectively. These revisions are in addition to the reestimates CBO already had made in August.

The President and the Congress have provided \$40 billion in additional funding to deal with the damage and the security threats, half of which is assumed to recur in future years. Congress appropriated \$5 billion in cash assistance for the airline industry, backed \$15 billion in loan guarantees, and provided the airlines with relief from liability for the disaster as well. The President's \$18 billion defense budget amendment to his original placeholder request has been built into the appropriations process, and further additions for defense appear inevitable. Again, on a bipartisan, bicameral basis, the staffs of the two Budget Committees have concluded that the total costs of these initiatives, plus debt service (on these programs plus the economic reestimates) will reduce the surplus by \$124 billion in 2002, and by \$793 billion over 2002–2011. And these estimates ignore the stimulus bill that is making its way through the Congress, and other unaddressed priorities such as the farm bill, education, expiring tax provisions, and the ballooning individual alternative minimum tax.

The President's enacted tax cut remains by far the largest single contributor to the deterioration of the budget outlook over the next ten years. Not including the stimulus bill or any other pending tax initiatives, the tax cut contributed more than half—54.7 percent—to the depletion of the surplus over the ten years 2002–2011.

The worsening of the economy (including technical reestimates) has had a significant impact in the near term (2001 to 2003 or so). Economic and technical factors dominate the figures (62.8 percent) in 2002. However, beyond those next few years, the effect of the economy fades as recovery is projected to take hold. For the last five years of the budget window, the share of the tax cut in the total worsening is over 60 percent—even assuming that all of the tax provisions will sunset at the end of 2010.

The impact of increased spending unrelated to the terrorist attack is small, averaging only 11.1 percent over the ten-year budget window. (For purposes of this analysis, all of the ten-year consequences of the President's request for \$18 billion per year of additional defense spending are included in this non-terror-related category.) Clearly, the effect of terrorism on the spending side of the budget is far from certain at this time. However, the bipartisan Budget Committee estimates suggests that the cost of recent and likely imminent action will be a small piece of the overall puzzle. Estimated anti-terror spending averages 11.0 percent of the worsening of the surplus over the ten years. (The impact of spending is projected to take a small jump in 2011, if the tax cut actually sunsets at the beginning of that year.)

Although today's estimated cumulative ten-year surplus remains as large as \$2.604 trillion, that figure is not comforting on closer examination. At the beginning of this year, the bipartisan goal in the Congress was to reserve the entire Social Security and Medicare Trust Fund surpluses, which were estimated in August to total \$2.955 trillion

(\$2.551 trillion for Social Security, and \$9.404 trillion for Medicare). Thus, the remaining projected unified surplus, on net over ten years, comes totally from those Trust Fund surpluses. The surplus that remains is still concentrated in future years, and even that surplus is likely to be eroded by the new economic and budget projections in January.

The deterioration of the surplus because of the weakening of the economy and the costs of resisting terrorism does not absolve the tax cut. Any future economic weakness, and any added costs for fighting terrorism will reduce the percentage of the total surplus deterioration that is directly due to the tax cut; and the reduction of that percentage might lead some to conclude that the tax cut is less at fault for the worsening budget. Taken to its extreme, this argument would say that the worse the budget gets, the less bad an idea the tax cut was.

But in a broader sense, such an argument misses a more important point: recent events prove even more that the tax cut was unwise. A central element in leadership and stewardship is to be prudent, to be prepared for adverse contingencies. It is not good stewardship to choose policies that make the budget more vulnerable—to tragedies, to economic misfortune, or ultimately to the burdens of the baby boomers' retirement.

The budget is almost certain to revert to unified deficit in 2002, and quite possibly in 2003 and 2004 as well. The direction for subsequent years is heavily dependent upon the state of the economy. But the Republican tax cut played a central role in these developments. This fact should serve as a cautionary flag to the Administration and Congressional Republicans who are now promoting a second tax cut which will dig the hole even deeper—a fact which should inform future policy choices, lest budget outcomes prove even worse.

This document demonstrates that the tax cut that passed earlier in the year contributed to more than half of the erosion of the surplus, 54.7 percent.

It points out that another significant portion was caused by the events in the aftermath of the September 11 attack on this country. And it also describes the remaining factors that led to the total disappearance of those surpluses.

Now not only are we facing the likelihood of no surpluses for the next few years, we are facing the likelihood of substantial deficits.

This Congress after they passed the first tax cut, this House again went on another binge, promising what it could not responsibly deliver, and wound up offering the largest corporations in this country more than \$25 billion cumulatively in 15-year retroactive tax cuts in the form of the repeal of the corporate minimum tax. And it has gone on to similar spending binges on the tax side of the ledger. And the tragedy, in addition to the loss of the surplus, has been that those tax cuts have been primarily directed at the people who need them least; and, therefore, they are tax cuts which are likely to have the least stimulative effect on the economy.

If you provide additional unemployment compensation to people, if you help them to pay for their health insurance if they have lost their job, they will spend, they will spend that money immediately and that will stimulate the economy. But the tax cut passed

earlier in the year by our majority friends in this House, when fully effective, will provide a \$52,000-a-year tax cut to the wealthiest people in this country. They will not spend most of this money. They will bank it. They will pocket it. That will not stimulate the economy. And yet that is what this Congress is hell-bent on doing. They are trying to do even more in that misguided stimulus package.

So while though the Congress is doing that and while the majority leadership is doing all of that, they are objecting to efforts on the part of some of us to provide additional homeland security by providing a small \$5.3 billion add-on to the budget for homeland security items as the Senate did last week. It just seems to me that that demonstrates that, in terms of protecting the country against future deficits, this House leadership has a spectacular ability to eat the hole in the doughnut, but they are not doing anything to deal with the doughnut.

So I do not know where that leaves us for next year, but it does not leave us in a very promising position. And the problem is that it will not only affect the country negatively next year, it will affect the country's economy negatively for a number of years to come.

We have seen this Congress, in 1 short year, squander the opportunity to use those surpluses, to do something with about the problems that still remain in Medicare, in Social Security, in prescription drugs, in quality education. So I think in the end, this Congress will go down in history as a Congress of missed opportunities, misplaced priorities.

I think that in the last 4 months what we have seen is an administration which has provided a very well managed war and a very poorly managed economy. I regret that dichotomy because in the end, it will come home to bite each and every working American; and that is something that simply did not have to happen.

But the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) is correct. This resolution needs to be passed. I hope that it will be the last one that needs to be passed and that we can produce these two or three bills that remain on the docket when the Congress reassembles on Wednesday next, as I understand the plan is.

I do want to thank the gentleman. I hope this is the last time we are going to be on the floor with one of these. I do want to thank the gentleman for doing his duty. When you are the Chair of the Committee on Appropriations or, for that matter, any member of the Committee on Appropriations, it is your job to expose the entire institution to reality. Everyone can have political philosophy. Everyone can have their political preferences. But in the end, numbers do not lie. Members of Congress can lie about the numbers, but the numbers themselves do not lie.

The fact is that the gentleman has tried to stick to the facts. He has been victorious sometimes and he has been overrun sometimes. And I know if his judgment were allowed to prevail, this Congress could have ended a whole lot sooner with really very minor adjustments in the overall budget, but adjustments that nonetheless would have been very important in strengthening the security of this country. And I regret on those matters that we will have to address them at a later day.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member on the Committee on Appropriations because he is right. When he pointed out how well the appropriations process has worked this year, he is exactly right; and that is because we had a good working relationship. We had some differences but we worked them out. And we got, except for one bill, we got very substantial votes on the other bills and I think that is a very good sign.

We got off to a little late start this year because the President was late getting started since it took a while to decide who was going to be President. So we were fairly late in getting the detailed appropriations request from the administration. But once we got started, it has been a while ago now, but I hope the House Members will remember that we actually passed all of our appropriations bills, except 3, prior to the July 4 recess. And two of those three that we did not pass, well, actually, all 3 of them, we were very late getting the District of Columbia budget request. So that bill is usually late because we are late getting their request.

The other 2 were Labor HHS and Health and Education, and that was because H.R. 1 had not passed yet. Shortly after H.R. 1 passed, which is the Education bill, then we did pass our Labor, Health and Education bill.

□ 1045

The other was national defense, and we were asked to hold up on the national defense bill until such time as the President could send us his budget amendment. That amendment arrived about the first week of July. Shortly after we received it, we began to do some hearings on the budget amendment. Then the August recess came; and so we sat in this Capitol building on September 11 to mark up that bill in the subcommittee, and it was that morning that the terrible, tragic terrorist attacks on the United States took place. The building was evacuated, the subcommittee had to leave, and following that we had to do the supplementals; so that bill got delayed. But the bulk of our work was completed in the House prior to the July 4

recess, and Members ought to be proud of that.

There is another reason we have had to have several continuing resolutions. If Members remember, one of the biggest complaints in previous years was that at the end of the process, we lumped five or six or seven bills altogether in an omnibus bill that no one had an opportunity to really understand what was in it, and months later we found things in the omnibus bill that surprised many of us. The hue and cry went up, no more omnibus bills.

Mr. Speaker, no omnibus bill this year. All 13 appropriations bills plus two supplementals have been done as they should be done.

So we come to the end of the process and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is correct, we both believe when the House comes back next week, the final appropriations bills will be prepared to be voted on, and the House will have completed its appropriations business by next week.

I thank Members for the support and correction that they have given us on both sides of the aisle. We have worked around our differences. As the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said, we were victorious on occasion. We lost a few, but the House worked its will. That is what the House is all about, the House works its will.

We have had strong leadership from the Republican side. The Speaker of the House has been a very strong leader and very strong supporter of the appropriations process. He understood the difficulties that we faced, and understood some of the decisions we had to make. But we come to the end of the process now. I think everyone is still smiling at each other, everyone is still shaking hands after the bills are completed, so I think we end the appropriations season with a pretty good feeling, and I thank all Members for that. I particularly thank the chairmen and ranking members of the subcommittees, and I particularly thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) as the ranking member, and I thank the members of the staff.

A lot of Members do not know this, but on so many occasions, to get an appropriations bill through the process requires many, many, many 24-hour days where the staff actually stays throughout the night. My staff is led by Jim Dyer, our clerk, and the staff of the ranking member is led by Scott Lilly. We have a good staff relationship. Some of these people work 24 hours a day on many, many days during an appropriation season. And it seems like the appropriation season goes all year long some years.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, when people here say that the staff has worked 24 hours around the clock, I think they think that is just figuratively. That is not the case. There are a number of occasions when many staffers on this committee have had to work for literally 2

to 3 days without ever having an hour of sleep. They have worked straight through. That will have to happen again if we are to finish the defense bill and the Labor-HHS bill in accordance with the schedule.

I do want to issue one warning because we have been told with respect to homeland security items, strengthening the FBI, giving greater security at the border, providing greater assistance to local public health officials in the event of an outbreak of biological or chemical attacks on this country by terrorists, we have been told do not worry, we can do that in March. There is plenty of time to do that in March. Members said that again to me yesterday.

If we look at the calendar for next year, this Congress is scheduled in January to have exactly 1 full day of session on January 24 and one-half day on January 23. The following week we will meet only after 5 p.m., and the next day there will be no votes after 2. So

that is about 2 legislative days in the entire month of January.

If we look at the calendar for February, I see there are 6 full legislative days scheduled in February, and 3 other days where there will be no real action until after 6:30 in the evening. Give or take, that is about 7 working days.

In March, the same thing, about 7½ full working days. If the Congress is to seriously consider supplemental appropriations for defense and for homeland security, to expect this Congress with that few number of working days to actually get something from the President, hold hearings, produce a bill in the House, send it to the Senate, have the Senate pass it and have those differences worked out, it would be phenomenally rare if Congress were able to act that quickly. For those who say "Do not worry about any security issues remaining, we can get this done by March," I suggest to those Members to read the calendar. It is not so likely.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 seconds to urge Members to support this continuing resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, December 12, 2001, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOTICE

Incomplete record of House proceedings. Except for concluding business which follows, today's House proceedings will be continued in the next issue of the Record.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4822. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amino-6-1(1,1-dimethylethyl)—3—(methylthio)—1, 2, 4-triazin-5 (4H)—one [Metribuzin], Dichlobenil, Diphenylamine, Sulprofos, Pendimethalin, and Terbacil; Tolerance Actions [OPP-300734A; FRL-6804-4] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received December 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4823. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Missouri [MO 0142-1142a; FRL-7110-5] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4824. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Revisions to State Plan for Municipal Waste Combustors and Incorporation of Regulation into State Implementation Plan for Ozone [CT067-7224a; A-1-FRL-7106-4] received December 3, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4825. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut; Ozone [CT057-7216a; FRL-7114-9] received December 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4826. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans For Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Vermont; Negative Declaration [VT 022-1225a; FRL-7116-6] received December 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4827. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; State of Kansas [KS 0140-1140a; FRL-7116-3] received December 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4828. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois [IL212-1a; FRL-7098-8] received December 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4829. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Indiana [IN122-1a; FRL-7107-9] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4830. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans; Illinois [IL210-1a; FRL-7111-1] received December 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4831. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois [IL213-1a; FRL-7107-7] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4832. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental

Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Illinois [IL211-1a; FRL-7108-8] received November 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4833. A letter from the Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Control of Emissions From Hospital / Medical / Infectious Waste Incinerators; State of Iowa [IA 0144-1144a; FRL-7117-5] received December 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4834. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Wisconsin; Automobile Refinishing Operations [WI109-01-7339a, FRL-7115-7] received December 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4835. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; State of Colorado; Denver Carbon Monoxide Redesignation to Attainment, Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes, and Approval of Related Revisions [CO-001-0045; CO-001-0046; CO-001-0047; CO-001-0052; CO-001-0053; CO49-1-7187; CO-001-0061; CO-001-0062; CO-001-0064 FRL-7117-4] received December 11, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

4836. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Control of Landfill Gas Emissions From Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills; State of Iowa [IA 0143-1143a; FRL-